

Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary just a few days before the election is appalling to me as a citizen and voter. It is also a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation.

Since Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, it is obligated by law to serve the public interest.

Unfortunately these lines of distinction get blurred when large companies control the airwaves; we get more of what's good for the corporate bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy. It's far more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter, instead of something produced at "News Central" at some far away location.

Additionally, isn't it required that if the media air political broadcasts of this kind, that they must give equal air time to the opposing point of view? Who will hold Sinclair to this standard, if not the FCC?

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. Thank you.